

REMARKS

In the Office Action dated May 19, 2005, claims 1-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Mastandrea, Jr. et al.

This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons. Claim 1 as originally filed stated that the coupling device *automatically* firmly joins the gradient coil unit to the patient bed mechanism when the patient bed mechanism moves toward and contacts the gradient coil in a movement direction. The use of "automatically" in this phrase was intended to have its normal dictionary meaning of something that ensues without any human intervention or manual steps. Applicants recognize, however, that one disclosed embodiment of the invention was for the coupling to take place by remote control. Even in that embodiment, it is still the case that the coupling itself ensues automatically, i.e., without any human intervention, but obviously operating any type of device by remote control requires, at some point, that a manual input be made at least to initiate the remotely controlled procedure. Even though such a manually actuated remote control does not alter the fact that the actual coupling takes place automatically, the specification has been amended, and claim 8 has been cancelled, in order to preclude an unintentionally overbroad interpretation of the scope of the word "automatically" in claim 1.

Moreover, claim 1 as originally filed further states that when the patient bed is again moved in the aforementioned movement direction, the coupling is released. In other words, release of the coupling takes place when the patient bed is moved in the same direction that automatically resulted in the coupling.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Mastandrea, Jr. et al. reference does not disclose any such automatic coupling of a patient bed to an insertable gradient

coil unit, nor does that reference disclose releasing the coupling when the patient bed is again moved in the same direction as caused the coupling.

In the detailed substantiation of the anticipation rejection based on Mastandrea, Jr. et al., the Examiner did not include any citation to the Mastandrea, Jr. et al. patent regarding either of these features. The Examiner merely stated:

The reference further teaches said guide device to include a portion that extends into the patient bed (column 7, lines 6-15) and said coupling device being remotely controlled to couple and uncouple the gradient coil unit and patient bed mechanism (column 7, lines 50-54).

The literal language of the passage in the Mastandrea, Jr. et al. reference describing engagement and disengagement of the coupler 52 is found at column 7, lines 52-54, and states:

The coupler 52 is manually or remotely controlled to engage and disengage from the trolley cage 58.

This is the one and only passage in the entirety of the Mastandrea, Jr. et al. disclosure that mentions engagement and disengagement of the coupler 52. Clearly, this passage provides no details whatsoever as to how such engagement and disengagement takes place, and thus this passage does not provide any teaching whatsoever that the coupling occurs, or should occur, automatically. Moreover, there is no teaching in this passage or any other passage in the Mastandrea, Jr. et al. reference as to how decoupling takes place. Specifically, there is no teaching in the Mastandrea, Jr. et al. reference to release the previously-made automatic coupling by again moving the patient bed in the same direction that effected the automatic coupling, as set forth in claim 1 of the present application.

The Mastandrea, Jr. et al. reference, therefore does not disclose all of the elements of claim 1 as arranged and operating in that claim, and therefore does not

anticipate claim 1. Claims 2-7 add further structure to the novel combination of claim 1, and are therefore not anticipated by the Mastandrea, Jr. et al. reference for the same reasons discussed above in connection with claim 1.

All claims of the application are therefore submitted to be in condition for allowance, and early reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Submitted by,

Steven H. Noll (Reg. 28,982)

SCHIFF, HARDIN LLP

CUSTOMER NO. 26574

Patent Department

6600 Sears Tower

233 South Wacker Drive

Chicago, Illinois 60606

Telephone: 312/258-5790

Attorneys for Applicants.

CH1\ 4312046.1